UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,919	07/14/2003	Aaron Cornelius	03797.00558	7973

28319   7590   03/07/2007

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NOS. 003797 & 013797
1100 13th STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER
CHOU, ANDREW Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/618,919	CORNELIUS ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Andrew Y. Chou	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 December 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 12/21/2006.

2. Claims 1 - 30 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims rejection have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. See Clauss et al. US 2002/0083377 A1 (hereinafter Clauss).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okita et al. US 6,225,998 B1 (hereinafter Okita) in view of Clauss et al. US 2002/0083377 A1 (hereinafter Clauss).

Claim 1:

Okita discloses a method of alerting a user to configuration errors of shapes representing software artifacts and displayed on a visual design surface, the method comprising:

(a) displaying an icon next to a shape to represent at least one configuration error associated with the shape (see for example column 15, lines 48-66, FIG. 5, item 504, and related text); and

However, Okita fails to disclose a method of alerting a user to configuration errors of shapes representing software artifacts and displayed on a visual design surface, the method comprising:

(b) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to a configuration error.

Clauss in the same analogous art of error handling discloses a method comprising:

(b) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to a configuration error (see for example FIGs. 4A, 4B, and related text).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Okita to include the method as disclosed above in Clauss. One would be motivated to do so to provide more information on the errors located, thus enhancing the system disclosed in Okita (see for example page 1, [0010]).

Claim 2:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 1, further including:

(c) comparing shape configuration parameters of the shape to configuration parameter

rules (see for example column 5, lines 41-51).

Claim 3:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the configuration parameter rules

are selected based on a context in which the shape is being used (see for example

column 5, lines 26-41).

Claim 4:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 2, wherein (c) is performed after (a) and

further including:

(d) removing the icon when the configuration error no longer exists (see for example

column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 5:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 2, wherein (c) is repeated periodically (see

for example column 5, lines 41-51).

Claim 6:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 5, wherein (c) is repeated when at least one

configuration parameter of the shape changes (see for example column 5, lines 41-51).

Claim 7:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 6, wherein (c) is repeated when at least one

configuration parameter of a shape other than the shape in (a) changes (see for

example column 5, lines 41-51).

Claim 8:

Clauss further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one proposed

solution comprises a dialog box (see for example FIGs. 4A, 4B, and related text).

Claim 9:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the dialog box prompts a user to

initialize a variable (see for example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 10:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the dialog box prompts a user to

set a configuration parameter (see for example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 11:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one proposed

solution comprises a wizard (see for example FIG. 3, item 302, and related text)

Claim 12:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one proposed

solution comprises creating a new design element (see for example column 5 line 57-

column 6, line 4).

Claim 13:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one proposed

solution comprises adding a shape (see for example column 6, lines 58-65).

Claim 14:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one configuration

error comprises a necessary shape that is not connected to the shape in (a) (see for

example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 15:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one configuration

error comprises configuration parameters set in an inconsistent manner (see for

example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 16:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 15, wherein the inconsistent configuration

parameters are configuration parameters of the same shape (see for example column

15, lines 48-66).

Claim 17:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 15, wherein the inconsistent configuration

parameters are configuration parameters of at least two shapes (see for example

column 15, lines 2- 14).

Claim 18:

Okita discloses a method of alerting a user of configuration errors of shapes

representing software artifacts and displayed on a visual design surface, the method

comprising:

(a) displaying an icon next to a container shape to represent at least one configuration

error with respect to a shape contained within the container shape (see for example

column 15, lines 48-66, FIG. 5, item 504, and related text); and

Okita does not disclose a method comprising:

(b) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to

the configuration error.

However, Clauss in the same analogous art of error handling discloses a method

. comprising:

(b) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to

the configuration error (see for example FIGs. 4A, 4B, and related text).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Okita to include the method as

disclosed above in Clauss. One would be motivated to do so to provide more

information on the errors located, thus enhancing the system disclosed in Okita (see for

example page 1, [0010]).

Claim 19:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 18, further including:

(c) expanding the container shape to display at least the shape contained within the

container shape (see for example column 15, lines 23-32); and

(d) displaying the icon next to a shape contained within the container shape and that

contains the at least one configuration error (see for example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 20:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 18, wherein the at least one configuration

error comprises a necessary shape that is not connected to the shape contained within

the container shape (see for example column 15 lines 48-66).

Claim 21:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 18, wherein the at least one configuration

error comprises configuration parameters set in an inconsistent manner (see for

example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 22:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 21, wherein the inconsistent configuration

parameters are configuration parameters of the same shape (see for example column

11, lines 53-61).

Claim 23:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 21, wherein the inconsistent configuration

parameters are configuration parameters of at least two shapes (see for example

column 11, lines 53-61).

Claim 24:

Okita discloses a method of alerting a user of configuration errors of shapes

representing software artifacts and displayed on a visual design surface, the method

comprising:

(a) comparing shape configuration parameters of a shape to configuration parameter

rules to identify configuration errors (see for example column 15, lines 48-64);

(b) determining a common error that causes the identified configuration errors (see for

example column 15, lines 48-64);

(c) displaying an icon next to a shape to represent the configuration errors (see for

example column 15, lines 48-64, FIG. 5, item 504, and related text).

Okita fails to disclose a method comprising:

(d) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to the common error.

However, Clauss in the same analogous art of error handling discloses a method comprising:

(d) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to the common error (see for example FIGs. 4A, 4B, and related text).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Okita to include the method as disclosed above in Clauss. One would be motivated to do so to provide more information on the errors located, thus enhancing the system disclosed in Okita (see for example page 1, [0010]).

Claim 25:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the at least one proposed solution comprises setting a configuration parameter (see for example column 5, lines 26-41).

Claim 26:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the at least one proposed solution comprises creating a new design element (see for example column 5 line 57-column 6, line 4).

Claim 27:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the at least one proposed solution comprises adding a shape (see for example column 6, lines 58-65).

Claim 28:

Okita further discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the common error comprises a necessary shape that is not connected to the shape in (a) (see for example column 15, lines 48-66).

Claim 29:

Okita discloses in a computer system (see for example FIG. 1, and related text) having a graphical user interface including a display and a user interface selection device, a method of indicating configuration errors of elements displayed on a visual design surface and representing software artifacts, the method comprising:

(a) displaying a plurality of the elements on the design surface (see for example FIG. 4, and related text);

(b) displaying an icon next to an element to identify a configuration error associated with the element (see for example column 15, lines 48-66).

Okita fails to disclose in a computer system, the method comprising:

(c) in response to a command from the interface selection device, displaying at least one proposed solution to the configuration error.

However, Clauss in the same analogous art of error handling discloses in a computer system (see for example FIG. 1, and related text), a method comprising:

(c) in response to a command from the interface selection device, displaying at least one proposed solution to the configuration error (see for example FIGs. 4A, 4B, and related text).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Okita to include the method as disclosed above in Clauss. One would be motivated to do so to provide more information on the errors located, thus enhancing the system disclosed in Okita (see for example page 1, [0010]).

Claim 30:

Okita discloses a computer readable medium (see for example FIG. 1, and related text) containing computer executable instructions for causing a computer system to perform the steps comprising:

(a) displaying on a design surface a plurality of shapes representing software artifacts (see for example FIG. 4, and related text);

(b) displaying an icon next to a shape to represent at least one configuration error associated with the shape (see for example FIG. 5, item 504, and related text).

Okita fails to disclose a computer readable medium comprising:

(c) in response to a user selecting the icon, displaying at least one proposed solution to a configuration error.

However, Clauss in the same analogous art of error handling discloses a computer readable medium (see for example FIG. 1, item 640, and related text) comprising:

(c) in response to a command from the interface selection device, displaying at least one proposed solution to the configuration error (see for example FIGs. 4A, 4B, and related text).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Okita to include the method as

disclosed above in Clauss. One would be motivated to do so to provide more

information on the errors located, thus enhancing the system disclosed in Okita (see for

example page 1, [0010]).

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Andrew Y. Chou whose telephone number is (571) 272-

6829. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 am – 4:30 pm. If

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached on (571) 272-3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding

is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed tot eh TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone

number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

AYC

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER